



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/593,361	06/14/2000	David A. Monroe	081829.000025	8359
7590		08/11/2004	EXAMINER	
Robert C Curfiss		BUGG, GEORGE A		
Jackson Walker LLP		ART UNIT		
112 E Pecan Street		2613		
Suite 2100		PAPER NUMBER		
San Antonio, TX 78205		12		
DATE MAILED: 08/11/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/593,361

Applicant(s)

MONROE, DAVID A.

Examiner

George A Bugg

Art Unit

2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 May 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33, and 41-46 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☒ Claim(s) 16, 17, 19, 20, 23-31 and 41-46 is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-12, 32 and 33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 13-15, 18, 21 and 22 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 14 June 2000 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-12, 32 and 33 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-12, 32, and 33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Patent No. 6,392,692 B1 to Monroe.
4. With regard to claim 1, Applicant claims **"A digital security camera capable of generating and transmitting digital high resolution image signals in both a full motion video format and a still image frame format."** Col. 10, Lines 53-56, of the Monroe reference teach a security system. Col. 11, Lines 53-60, further state that a digital camera may be used, and that the camera is capable of capturing full motion or still frame images. Next Applicant claims **"an image transducer"**. A transducer is defined as a device, which transforms one form of energy into another form. In this

Art Unit: 2613

case, Monroe discloses, Col. 11, Lines 53-60, that the camera is capable of converting analog to digital. Furthermore, most security cameras convert image data into electrical signal for transmission purposes. Applicant further claims **a motion video compressor and a still frame compressor, associated with the image transducer for compressing and generating compressed signals of full motion and still frame image data respectively.** Again, attention is drawn to Col. 11, Lines 53-60, wherein Monroe states that the camera may utilize internal compression, and that full motion and still image data can be captured by the camera. Furthermore, Col. 12, Lines 56-67, wherein Monroe discloses the need for images captured by cameras to be compatible with the ground station. **It should also be noted that Applicant's claim requires capturing and compressing still and full motion video either alternately or simultaneously. Only of these limitations must be met to constitute a proper rejection under 35 USC 103(a) since the two are linked by the word "or". Monroe teaches still and full motion video being captured, compressed, and transmitted alternately.** Claim 1 further calls for **"a processor associated with the multiplexer for generating a conditioned output image signal suitable for transmission over a network; and network gateway."** As further disclosed by Monroe, in Col. 12, Lines 56-67, digital transmission may be accomplished by placing converters, or processors, at the camera transmitting unit, for transmitting over wireless digital systems, such as LAN and W-LAN. LAN and W-LAN are in fact networks. As for multiplexing of still and full motion video to create a combined video signal, column 6, lines 35-57, of the Monroe reference teach multiplexing a plurality of data, which includes visual image

Art Unit: 2613

data. While it does not specifically disclose multiplexing still and motion video it has been shown, that the Monroe invention is capable of capturing and compressing both still and full motion video, and that multiple signals can be multiplexed, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to ascertain that the two video signals (still and full motion) can and are being multiplexed by the system of Monroe.

5. As for claim 2, Applicant claims **“a compressed still frame image data signal of higher resolution than the compressed full motion video image data signal.”** In Col. 12, Lines 22-39, Monroe discloses the ability to reduce bandwidth by utilizing known compression techniques. Therefore, resolution variation is possible.

6. With regard to claim 3, Col. 4, Lines 59-64 Monroe states that the cameras of the system may be activated by data provided by a GPS system.

7. With regard to claims 4 and 6, Applicant claims an **“event detector”**. Col. 15, Lines 61-64, of Monroe disclose, that each camera of the system may utilize a motion sensor, which is synonymous with an event detector, to activate the system.

8. As for claim 5, a manually operated switch is not patentably significant. In column 4, lines 52-64, Monroe teaches that cameras may be manually operated by crew or ground personnel. It is the Examiner's contention that manually turning on a camera to record an event, and or manually flipping a switch to enable a camera to capture an event are one in the same.

Art Unit: 2613

9. As for claims 7-10, Col. 16, Lines 64-67, of Monroe disclose smoke detectors, audio sensors, and motion sensors. Furthermore, Monroe teaches alarm events throughout the reference.

10. As for claim 11, Figures 2a and 2b shows wireless receivers and transmitters, and further shows a wireless camera or sensor, which generates a signal. It is well known in the art of surveillance to utilize a sensor to activate a camera.

11. With regard to claim 12, Figure 13 shows the use of multiple image sensors, or transducers, and two multiplexers, one for combining the image data, and one for combining all multiplexed data into one signal, as further explained in Col. 22, Lines 16-33. The combination of parts into a single camera is rendered obvious in view of Monroe, wherein the function, as claimed, is performed by the system shown in the cited Figure.

12. As for claims 32 and 33, Col. 12, Lines 22-40, disclose the use MPEG and JPEG algorithms for full motion compression.

Conclusion

2. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to George A Bugg whose telephone number is (703) 305-2329. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday 9:00-6:30, and every other Friday.


If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Christopher S Kelley can be reached on (703) 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2613

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

George A Bugg
Examiner
Art Unit 2613

August 4, 2004


CHRIS KELLEY
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600